

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 19 through 29 are pending. Claims 1-18 are cancelled; claims 19, 21 and 22 are amended, and new claims 23-29 are added. The application is believed to be in condition for allowance and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 18 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,119,101 to Peckover.

In the Office Action, the examiner stated that "[t]he prior art taken alone or in combination failed to teach or suggest 'wherein the who/what, why/how and where/when information is input to the system through the secondary interface in a manner that conforms the common database objects to the common date format and operating rule such that why information + how information = where/when information' as recited in claim 19." (See Office Action, 2/10/06, pg. 4, paragraph 3.)

Applicant has amended claim 19 to include all of the limitations of independent claim 18, from which it depends. Thus, applicant believes claim 19 to be allowable. Claims 21 and 22 have been amended to depend from claim 19, and thus are believed to be allowable for the same reasons as stated for claim 19.

Claims 1-3 and 18 have been cancelled, thus rendering the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of these claims moot.

New Claims 23-26

New independent claim 23 has been added, and recites, *inter alia*,

"An electronic system for managing, processing, and automating electronic or digital activities . . . wherein [a] common data format enables the user to provide who/what type information relating to the activity, why/how information relating to the activity, and where/when information relating to the activity . . . wherein said who/what type, why/how and where/when information when processed by the system, according to the operating rule, works so that why information+ how information = where/when information, to achieve the purpose of the said intelligent database object."

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

010/010

JUN 12 2006

In the Office Action, the examiner stated that "[t]he prior art taken alone or in combination failed to teach or suggest 'wherein the who/what, why/how and where/when information is input to the system through the secondary interface in a manner that conforms the common database objects to the common date format and operating rule such that why information + how information = where/when information . . .'" (See Office Action, 2/10/06, pg. 4, paragraph 3.) Thus, for the same reasons as noted by the examiner as regards claim 19, applicant believes that new independent claim 23 is allowable. With respect to claims 24-26, which depend from claim 23 and recite additional features of the invention, applicant believes these claims to be allowable for the same reasons as stated for claim 23.

New Claims 27-29


New claims 27-29 depend from independent claim 19, and thus are believed to be allowable for the same reasons as stated for claim 19.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to that effect is respectfully requested.

A fee of **\$60.00** is believed due with this submission to accompany a petition for a one-month extension of time to extend the date for reply up to and including **June 12, 2006**. The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge this, and any other required fees to deposit account **50-2061**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 12, 2006


Jeffrey M. Chamberlain, Reg. No.: 55,044
Attorney for Applicants

DUANE MORRIS LLP
P.O. Box 5203
Princeton, NJ 08543-5203
(609) 631-2491 (Telephone)
(609) 919-2401 (Fax)